

# MEMOIRS OF LITERATURE.

MONDAY, April 10, 1710.

To be continued Weekly.

## I.

A LETTER to the Bishop of Soissons, concerning a Brass Figure representing a Young Man, who holds a Patera with the left Hand, and a bended Vessel with the other.

PATIN in his *Numismata ex Aere media & minima formae*, Casalius in his *Roman Antiquities*, M. B.— in his *Ptolemaeus Auletes*, take Notice of this Figure. The First gives no Explication of it: The Second only mentions it by the by: The Third maintains, that it represents one who plays upon a winding Flute. With all due Deference to the Reputation of so Learned a Judge as M. B.— I must beg leave to differ from his Opinion, and propose another which seems more Probable, if not Demonstrative.

'Tis a Matter of Fact beyond all dispute, that the Ancients had young People to wait at Table. Their Air was graceful, their Head Crown'd, their Hair curl'd, and their Cloaths were tuck'd up and girt about. Their Business was to fill out Wine; take away from Table, &c. Horace gives a very particular Description of them.

*Persicos odi, Puer, apparatus,  
Displacent nexe phylira corona.*

*Neq; te ministrum*

*Dedecet Myrtus, &c.*

*I, pete unguentum, Puer, & coronas*

*Et cadum, &c.*

*Præcincti rectè Pueri, comptique ministrant, &c;*

*His ubi sublatis Puer alte cinctus acernam*

*Gauſape purpureo mensam perterſit, & alter*

*Sublegit quodcumque, &c.*

*Aderit ministrorum turba linteis succincta, per quos signo  
dato, &c. Seneca.*

Juvenal confirms the same thing.

*Puerum te,*

*Et pulchrum & dignum cyatho, &c.*

The Custom of being serv'd by these Young Men, was taken from the Story of Jupiter and Ganymede. Their Crowns were made of Roses, or any other Flowers the Season afforded; as appears from a Passage in one of Tully's Orations against Verres.

Now all these Circumstances occur in the Figure I endeavour to explain. The Face discovers that Air of Youth and Beauty, which made 'em go at so high a rate, that Martial says:

*Centenis quod emis Pueros ducentis, &c.*

The Hair is curl'd, and lies agreeably adjusted with all that Nicety and Care they us'd to take, for fear of discomposing it; which gave occasion to the Proverb, *Unico digito scalpit caput*. His Cloaths are tuck'd up, like those of a Domestick, *Puer alte cinctus*.

In his left hand, he holds something which resembles a *Patera*. If so, what Relation has this to a Flute? If not, what then is it, and to what purpose? But 'tis a *Patera*: *Statius* may determine the Matter.

*Pateram famulis ex more poposcit, &c.*

The *Patera* was us'd at Meals for Libations. And *Virgil* informs us, they were Crown'd, *Pateramq; Corona induit*. The greatest Difficulty lies in distinguishing what it is this Figure holds in the Right Hand; because it is a bended Instrument. But every one knows, the Ancients were very Fantastical in the Fashion of their Vessels. This seems to be one of those Horns they us'd in Drinking. The Custom was very Ancient, as appears from *Homer*, *Xenophon*, *Athenaeus*, and *Plutarch*.

However, my Lord, it is more probably one of those Vessels, of another sort of Matter, and so turn'd as to make the Extremity more plainly represent those Obscenities, which *Pliny*, as much a Heathen as he was, very passionately lamented: *Libidines calare iuvit, ac per obscenitatem bibere*. They were made of Metal, Glass, or Crystal. *Martial* frequently mentions them.

The only Scruple which remains is, that the Largeness of the Vessel seems to render it unfit to be us'd in Drinking. But this Doubt will soon vanish, if we recollect that the Ancients lov'd to swill a Bumper; (which *Horace* calls *assuetum græcari*) and that they had some Cups which stood upon the Table, others which must be immediately drunk off, because they were not made to stand. My Authorities are *Horace* and *Martial*.

*Nos nisi damnosus bibimus morientur inulti,  
Et calices poscunt majores, &c.*

*Post hoc ludus erat cuppa potare magistra, &c.*

*Cum fuerit multis exacta trientibus hora, &c.*

*Sextantem poto, tu potas, Canna, deuincem, &c.*

*Tolle Puer calices,*

*Pocula trade manu.*

There's one Objection still remains. What cou'd induce them to cast the Figure of a Butler, or a Page? But, if we consider the Corruption of those Times, we shall find it no strange thing, that the Passion of the Masters should preserve us this Monument.

I have opposed the Opinion of *Giacenius*, who says, the Glasses always stood upon the Table; which he infers from this Verse of *Ovid*:

*Nunc dape, nunc posito mensa nituisse Lyao.*

I am, My Lord,

Your Lordship's most Humble, &c.

*F. SPIRADION POUPART,*

*Religious of the Third Order of S.*

*Francis or Picpus.*

*E II. LET.*

## II.

LETTRE du Th. de Sal. à M. l'Abbé B—— sur la nouvelle Edition du Manuscrit Alexandrin. That is, *A Letter of a Divine of Salamanca to the Abbot B. concerning the new Edition of the Alexandrian Manuscript.* ('Tis said, this Divine of Salamanca, and M. de Sainjore, mention'd in this Letter, are but one and the same Person; viz. M. Simon, who has thought fit to conceal himself under those Fictitious Names.)

SIR,

In Obedience to your Commands I shall give you my Thoughts concerning the New Edition of the Alexandrian Manuscript.

It seems to me, that we can form no great Idea of this Manuscript from the Description Dr. Grabe gives of it. The Consonants, Vowels, and Diphthongs, are often confounded one with another; the Letters are not all of the same size, but smaller and closer at the end of the Lines; and after five, six, twelve, or fifteen Lines, a new Line begins with a Capital Letter, which frequently happens to be at the end of a Period, in the middle of a Phrase, and even of a Word. All this hath convinced Dr. Grabe that the Transcriber did not understand what he writ; and he adds that it would be no wonder, if the MS. had been written by the Companions of *Thecla*. This Copy has been sometimes improperly corrected and supplied in the Margin. Some later Transcribers have blotted out whole Verses, and writ other Words over them, or at least laid new Ink upon Lines worn out by time, whereby the first Reading is lost, or become very doubtful.

Notwithstanding all these Imperfections, Dr. Grabe pretends, that the Alexandrian MS. is much to be preferr'd to that of the Vatican.

M. de Sainjore says, the Learned Criticks have hitherto given the Preference to the Edition of *Rome*. 'Tis true Father Morin, Archbishop Usher, Bishop Walton, M. Simon, and several others, have been of that Opinion; but perhaps \*\*\* Dr. Grabe, having the Alexandrian MS. in his Hands, has carefully examin'd it, and may give a better Judgment of it than those great Criticks. M. de Sainjore says only, that in order to know what Greek Copy comes nearest to the Genuine Text of the Septuagint, one ought to have a Manuscript with *Asterisks* and *Obeli*, like that of the Jesuits; that if Isaac Vossius had followed this Method, he wou'd not have been so positive as to say that the Alexandrian Copy is the most accurate; that, on the contrary, it is far from being one of the best; and that the Edition of *Rome*, made from the Ancient MS. of the Vatican, is the most faithful; because that MS. is the most simple, though it was not written by one and the same hand. This is a new Opinion of M. de Sainjore, whereof no Footstep is to be seen in any of his preceding Books. It were to be wish'd he had prov'd his Assertion; for he cou'd not be ignorant in the Year 1709, when he publish'd his *Bibliothèque Critique*, that Dr. Grabe pretends to prove in the Preface of his *Octateuch*, by Three undeniable Arguments, that the Alexandrian Copy is much more considerable than that of the Vatican, particularly in the *Pentateuch*, and the Book of *Joshua*; and in his Letter to Dr. Mill, publish'd in the Year 1705, that the Book of *Judges*, in the Manuscript of the Vatican, is not the Edition of *Origen*, but that of *Hesychius*. And yet he followed the Method mention'd by M. de Sainjore: He has seen a Copy with *Asterisks* and *Obeli*, and given a quite different Judgment from that of M. de Sainjore, who is contented to say that the MS. of the Vatican is preferable to the Alexandrian, without answering the Arguments alledged by Dr. Grabe.

The Doctor believed at first, that the Alexandrian MS. was to be preferr'd to that of the Vatican, especially in the *Pentateuch*; but that the latter was not so faulty, and

had not so many Additions in the Prophets. He suspected for a long time that the MS. of the Vatican contain'd the Edition of *Lucian* or *Hesychius*. But he says now, that the *Roman* and *Alexandrian* Copies contain in the Book of *Judges*, two different Versions, or at least Two Versions very different from one another; which is the Reason why the Scholiast, mention'd in the Edition of *Rome*, Chap. 11, 12, and 15. call'd one of 'em, *ἄντερος, another Edition.* (But it ought to be observed, that this Scholiast call'd *ἄντερος*, the Edition, whose Words he quotes agreeably to the *Alexandrian* MS. to shew wherein it differ'd from the Version of the Septuagint, on which he writ his *Scholia*, and which agreed with the MS. of the Vatican.) The Doctor adds, that the *Alexandrian* Copy agrees with the *Hexapla* of *Origen*, and represents the true and Genuine Translation of the Septuagint; that the MS. of the Vatican contains the Edition of *Hesychius*, or the Version of some other Author; for he is still doubtful about it: An Edition wherein the Words are altered, and the Sense designedly perverted, almost in every Section or Member of a Period, so that it cannot be correct; *Adeo ut correctionem non admittat.*

It had been better for Dr. Grabe to stick to his first Opinion, and not to decide about the Preference of one of the two most Ancient MSS. of the Septuagint that are now extant in Europe. He might have imitated the Modesty of the Learned Father Morin; who being perhaps as well qualify'd, as the Doctor, to judge of it, does not say that the *Alexandrian* MS. is, but that it *seems to be* the Edition of *Hesychius*, *Hesychiana videtur MS. Editio*; That the Character of the *Roman* MS. appears to him somewhat more Ancient than that of the *Alexandrian*; That the Edition of *Rome*, as far as he can judge, seems to exceed all others, and even the *Alexandrian* Copy, as not having so many Foreign Additions and Interpolations; That he speaks his Mind freely, without pretending to prejudice or despise the *Alexandrian* MS.; yet perhaps he wou'd be of another Opinion, if he had read more of it; that he does not ascribe to the Edition of *Rome* an absolute and perfect Integrity in all its Parts, and will not deny that in many places it might be mended by the *Alexandrian* MS.

But Dr. Grabe thought he cou'd not raise the Reputation of his MS. but upon the Ruins of the *Roman* Copy; and to that end has very roughly used it, taking it to be *Hesychius*'s Edition.

I shall enquire whether his Arguments can justify his Proceeding.

I. I begin with what he says in his Preface to the *Octateuch*. He pretends that the *Alexandrian* MS. is much to be preferr'd to that of the *Vatican*; especially in the *Octateuch*, for Three Reasons.

First, because it agrees better with the Quotations of *Philo*, and the ancient Greek Fathers, and the Fragments of the Ancient *Italick* Version, that are still extant in *Tertullian*, *St. Cyprian*, and other *Latin* Fathers.

But the Quotations of *Philo*, and the ancient Greek Fathers, are not always the true Readings of the Septuagint, but of the Copies they used, which sometimes were none of the most correct; for in *Philo*'s, as well as in *Origen*'s Time, some Copies were more correct than others. I desire no other Proof for it than the Examples alledged by Dr. Grabe, who observes, that in *Levit. V. 4.* the *Alexandrian* MS. and *Philo* (he might have added the Editions of *Rome* and *Venice*) have *ἄντερος* *ν*, though the true Reading be *ἄντερος* *ον* according to the *Hebr. w.* From whence it appears, that the MS. of *Philo* was faulty, as well as those from which the MSS. of *Rome*, *Alexandria*, and *Venice*, have been transcribed; and others were correct, and had the true Reading, since it is to be found in *Origen*, whose Interpreter reads it, *quaे juraverit*, and *St. Augustin*, *quacun; uo juraverit*.

*Gen. III. 2. ἀπὸ μαρτίου τὸ Εὐλόγ.* Such is the reading of the *Alexandrian* MS. of *Theophilus*, *St. Irenaeus*, *St. Ambrose*, *St. Augustin*, *Procopius*, and *St. Chrysostom*.

*απὸ ναρ. τὸ Εὐλόγ.* Such is the Reading of the Editions of *Rome* and *Venice*, and of the MS. of *Oxford*, and *St. Augustin*, according to the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Texts.

Dr. Grabe says, he has not mended the Reading of his MS. by inserting the other in the Margin, according to the Rule he prescribed himself, because the Reading of the

the *Alexandrian* MS. is the true one, and the most ancient, as it appears from the Quotations of the ancient Fathers. But he shou'd have observed that those Quotations are not less Faulty for being Ancient; from whence it may be infer'd, that the Copies of those Ancient Fathers were not correct, and that in their own time there were some more correct, from which the MSS. of the Editions of *Rome* and *Venice* were transcribed, and likewise the MS. of *Oxford*, and that of *St. Augustin*, which contain'd the true and ancient Reading of the Septuagint, according to the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Text. Dr. *Grabe* derives it from the Edition of *Lucian* or *Hesychius*; but he shou'd have said something to confirm his Conjecture. He adds, that the Septuagint might have read *miccol* for *mipperi*; which is very far-fetched.

*Numb. XXIII. 19, μετανοεῖ*. Such is *Philo*'s Reading, pag. 646. *μετανόηει*, MS. of *Oxford*.

*ἀπειλῶνται*. So 'tis in *Judith* VIII. 15. *S. Cypr. Orig. Theodoret*, and the Editions of *Compl. Ven. Rom. Alex.*

Dr. *Grabe* says he made no Alteration in the *Alexandrian* Copy, because *Origen* and *St. Cyprian* confirm that Reading, which is also to be found in the Book of *Judith*. He adds, that *Philo*, finding this Reading obscure and improper, quotes it, and renders it more clearly according to the *Hebrew*, as he does in some other Passages, though but seldom; and that the Reading of the MS. of *Oxford* proceeds from a like Correction of *Lucian*, *Hesychius*, or *Apollinaris*.

Our Author owns therefore, that *Philo* does not always follow the Version of the Septuagint; and that he substitutes another Version, clearer and more agreeable to the *Hebrew*, in many Places; tho' he adds, 'tis but seldom. How then can we rely upon the Quotations of that Jew? Must we take the Words he substitutes, for the True Readings of the Septuagint? Is it not more probable that *Philo*, who did not understand *Hebrew*, quotes in this place the Reading of his Copies, which from one Manuscript to another, came into that of *Oxford*; without having Recourse to the Corrections of *Lucian*, *Hesychius*, or *Apollinaris*; and that there were other Copies, which contain'd a more Ancient Reading than that of *Philo*, (since the Author of the Book of *Judith* has it,) which Reading is to be found in *St. Cyprian*, *Origen*, *Theodoret*, and all our Manuscripts? And yet tho' this Reading be so Ancient, Dr. *Grabe* has been pleased not to strike it out of his Manuscript. What Reason cou'd he have to alter it; unless, according to the Rule he prescribes himself, he had preferr'd *Philo*'s Reading consonant to the *Hebrew*, to that which does not agree with it, which he calls obscure and improper? Wherein he is mistaken; for *ἀπειλῶνται* perfectly expresses the Force of the *Hebrew* Word, *itnahem*, from the Passive *אָלַמְתָּ*, *vertor*, *mutor*, and *לְמַתָּה* an Augmentative. *Hesychius* renders *εἰλήθην*, *ἐσεγένετο*; and *Theodoret* understood it so, when he said, *ἀπειλῶνται οὐ διανοίωσιν ή τοι θεού φύσις*, *Immutabilis & invariabilis est Dei Natura*. And therefore these Words, *εἰδούσις διδόπαγοι* *ἀπειλῶνται*, ought to be rendered, *Non ut filius hominis ut mutetur*, as *St. Jerom* renders them; not, *ut minis terreat*, or *terreatur*, from *ἀπειλέομαι*, to threaten, or to be threaten'd. I add, that in the first Hemistich of the same Verse, *Philo*'s Reading, *διαταθῶνται*, which differs from that of *Judith*, *διαταθῶνται*, or *διατηθῶνται* in *Origen*, *St. Cyprian*, *Theodoret*, and all our Manuscripts, is a further Proof of the Difference of Copies, even in *Philo*'s Time. And I shall observe by the by, that tho' *διατηθῶνται* makes a tolerable Sense, *Non est Deus quasi homo ut suspendatur, suspensus maneat, suspenso & inconsanti animo sit*; one might suspect, that the true Reading of the Septuagint was, *διαταθῶνται*, *Non est Deus quasi homo ut fallat*; *St. Jerom*, *ut mentiatur*; the *Hebrew* Word signifying to lye and to deceive.

*Hosea IV. 14. οὐ λαὸς οὐ σωτῆρ*. So we read in the Editions of *Venice*, *Rome*, and *Alexandria*, and in *Clemens Alexandrinus*; who adds, *σινευούσι διτῷ φαρετογον τοι αἴσθηται*, *σωτεῖας διτῷς οὐμολογοῦσι*, *οὐ σκοτεῖς αἴσθητον ταῖς*. *Eorum peccatum apertius ostendit*, *dum eos intelligere fatetur*, *velut qui sua sponte peccarent*. From whence it appears, that this Father read this Passage without a Negative. But *Clemens*'s Reading is faulty, according to Dr. *Grabe*: The Edition of *Complutum*, and *Theodoret* read, *οὐ λαὸς οὐ σωτῆρ*, correctly, and according to the *Hebrew*, and the *Hexapla* of *Origen*, which *St. Jerom* renders, *populus non*

*intelligens*. Thus we have here another faulty Reading of the Ancient Fathers; but I will not insist upon it, to swell the Number; it may be the true Reading of the Septuagint. Dr. *Grabe* may, if he pleases, insert the Negative Particle in his Edition, and corrupt his Copy from the Authority of *Origen*'s *Hexapla*, out of which the Edition of *Complutum*, *Theodoret*, and *S. Jerom* took the Negative Particle. For my own part, I mistrust the Corrections of *Origen*; I don't take 'em to be the true Readings of the Septuagint. He made his Corrections from the *Hebrew*, or rather from other *Greek* Versions, *utens iudicio ceterarum editionum*; and therefore finding a Negative Particle in the *Hebrew* and the other Versions, he boldly corrupted the Text, reading the Passage negatively. It may very well be, that the Septuagint did not read the Negative Particle, as it appears from the Quotation of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and the Reading of our Manuscripts; and that in the Interval of Time that passed between their Translation and that of *Aquila*, the Negative Particle was inserted in the *Hebrew* Text by a hasty or rash Transcriber, who fancy'd it was necessary, and that *Populus non intelligens* made a better Sense than *Populus intelligens*. Dr. *Grabe* says, he has omitted the Additions of *Origen*, when they seem'd to him needless, superfluous, or wrongly inserted in the Translation of the Septuagint; and from a Passage in the *Numbers*, he infers that *Origen* added another Version to that of the Septuagint, when he did not like it. This is not a proper Place to enquire whether the Doctor does justly censure *Origen*, but to draw this Consequence from his own Confession; viz. That the Corrections of *Origen* don't contain the true Readings of the Septuagint.

As for the Ancient *Latin* Fathers, all of 'em do not quote the *Italick* Version; but they make use of other Translations, or they themselves translate the *Greek*. *Ut enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manus venit Codex Graecus, & aliquantulum facultatis sibi metuens Lingua habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari*, says *S. Augustin*. Nor is it certain that their Copies, and those, from which the *Italick* and other *Latin* Translations have been made, were so Correct, that we ought to look upon the Fragments of those Versions, that are still extant, as containing every where the true Readings of the Septuagint.

The Second Reason, alledg'd by the Doctor, is, That the *Alexandrian* MS. comes nearest to the pure and correct Edition of the Septuagint in the *Hexapla* of *Origen*; whose Labour wou'd have been very insignificant, if by Comparing the different Manuscripts of the Septuagint, and other *Greek* Versions, he had not given an Edition of the Septuagint more correct than it was before.

The Method of *Origen*, in Comparing the different Manuscripts of the Septuagint, and Preferring such Readings as were most agreeable to other *Greek* Versions, was liable to Error; and he might, according to this Method, have rejected many true Readings of the Septuagint, which did not appear to him consistent with other *Greek* Translations, and consequently with the *Hebrew* Text. But 'tis none of my Business to examine the Purity and Correctness of that Edition: I shall only suppose it; and enquire whether the *Alexandrian* MS. comes nearer to it than that of the *Vatican*. Dr. *Grabe* affirms it without any Proof: He shou'd have quoted some Passages corrected by *Origen*, that are to be found in the *Alexandrian* MS. and not in the *Roman* Copy. Of the 41 Differences between the *Koyn* and the Edition of the *Hexapla* in the *Psalms*, mention'd by *St. Jerom* in his Epistle to *Sunia* and *Fretella*, there are 19 wherein the MSS. of *Rome* and *Alexandria* agree with the *Koyn*, and 6, wherein the *Alexandrian* only agrees with it.

The Third Reason is, That the *Alexandrian* MS. agrees better with the *Hebrew* Text, not generally, but in certain Places, wherein the *Greek* Words of both Copies differ only in one Letter or Syllable; one whereof agrees with the *Hebrew*, and is doubtless Genuine; and the other does not agree with it, has a Signification very different from the *Hebrew* Root, or any other Root that comes near the *Hebrew*, and is doubtless corrupted. In those Passages the *Alexandrian* MS. contains the word that agrees with the *Hebrew* oftener than that of *Rome*. But perhaps the word that agrees with the *Hebrew*, will be found as frequently, if not more, in the Edition of *Rome*. The Doctor alledges as an instance of what he says, *Amos VI.*

5. οἱ ὀπότετες, applaudentes, as 'tis in the *Alexandrian Copy*, and the Fathers who have Commented upon that Passage, agreeably to the *Hebrew Text*; whereas we read οἱ ὀπότετες, dominantes, in the Edition of *Rome*. But this is only a mistake of the Transcriber. Are there no Mistakes in the *Alexandrian Copy*, as well as in that of the *Vatican*? Is there any Copy free from such Faults? Such Errors are easily and frequently committed by Copyists. But is one single Example sufficient to make a Rule? Why does the Doctor take this Instance out of *Amos*, since he pretends that according to his Three Rules, the *Alexandrian MS.* is more valuable than that of the *Vatican*, especially in the *Octateuch*? Here is an Example taken from the *Octateuch*, and even from the Book of *Judges*, that may give the Dr. full Satisfaction. 'Tis Chap. II. v. 15. where the Editions of *Rome* and *Venice*

have ἐποδούτο, ibant, according to the *Hebrew*; whereas in the *Alexandrian Copy*, and the Edition of *Complutum*, 'tis ἐπόγδοον, fornicabantur, a word which has a very different Signification from the *Hebrew Root*, or any other Root that comes near the *Hebrew*, and is doubtless a Corruption.

Thus *Job* 39. 18. there is γατὴ γατὴν in the Edition of *Rome*, according to the *Hebrew*; and in the *Alexandrian Copy*, γαταριδεων, which is a Word plainly corrupted.

And 4. *Reg.* 11, 12. We read in the Edition of *Rome*, ἐπίπνημ, which agrees with the *Hebrew*, and other Editions; but in the *Alexandrian MS.* 'tis ἐπάπτετον, which is certainly a Corruption.

*This Letter shall be continued in our next.*

### B R E S L A W.

**M.** *Krantz*, Professor of Natural Philosophy and History, and Library-Keeper of *Elizabeth-College*, has newly publish'd an Abridgment of Universal History, from the beginning of the World to the end of the XVII. Century.

*Compendium Historiae Civilis ab orbe condito usque ad finem Seculi XVII. in 8vo. pagg. 462.*

This Work will be of great use to those who design to learn History; for Two Reasons. 1. The Author never mentions any Fact, without quoting an Authority for it. His Quotations are inserted at the Bottom of each Page. 2. When he begins the History of a particular Country, he names the Authors who have enlarged upon it.

### C O L O G N E.

**F**ather *de Bokentop*, a Cordelier, has newly publish'd a Book upon the Holy Scripture, divided into Three Parts. The First contains an Explication of those Passages of the Scripture, that have been ambiguously translated in the Vulgar, as he thinks. In the Second, he mentions the various Readings of different Editions of the Bible. The Third concerns the Edition publish'd in 1590. by order of Pope *Sixtus V.*

*Lux de luce. Libri tres. In quorum primo ambigua locutiones, in secundo variae ac dubiae Lectiones, que in vulgata Latina S. Scripturae editione occuruntur. In tertio agitur de Editione Sixti V. facta anno 1590. in 4to. pagg. 530.*

### G I E S S E N.

**M.** *VALENTINUS*, a Physician and Philosopher of this City, has publish'd an Introduction to the Modern Philosophy, &c.

*Michaelis Bernhardi Valentini, Medici & Philosophi Giffeni, Armamentarium Naturae Systematicum, seu Introductio ad Philosophiam Modernorum naturalem, per formam institutionum, aphoristica olim tradita, nunc vero perpetuo Commentario & Fig. aneis illustrata. Accedit Historia Literaria S. R. J. Academicae Naturae Curiosorum, antebac seorsim continuata, nunc primum conjunctim edita. Giffae-Hassorum, in 4to.*

This Introduction is a Curious and Methodical Abridgment of Philosophy. It contains in a good Order the various Opinions of Philosophers concerning the Knowledge of Nature; and consists of Two Parts. The first comprehends Philosophy in general; and the Second gives a particular Account of that Science.

The *Historia Literaria Academicae Naturae Curiosorum*, which the Author has added to this Work, contains several Extracts of the most Valuable Pieces, written by the Learned Members of that Academy, concerning Minerals, Vegetables, and Animals.

There is at the End of this Book the Natural History of the *Landgraviat of Hesse-Cassel*, consisting of 38 Pages.

It begins with a Description of the Soil of that Country, its Mountains and Vallies; and then the Author treats of the Winds and Waters. In the next place he examines Fossils, and concludes with Animals.

### L U C E R N E.

**M.** *Langius*, who has given us an Historical Account of the figured Stones to be found in *Switzerland*, has now publish'd a Treatise concerning their Origin. Some say they were conveyed to the Mountains by the Waters of the Deluge, where they remain'd and petrified. Others will have it, that the small Seeds of Shell-fish ascend from the Sea, through Subterraneous Passages, into the highest Mountains, where being mixed with petrifying Matter, they grow into Stony Bodies very like Sea-Shells. These Two Opinions are carefully examin'd by *M. Langius*, who has divided his Treatise into Two Books. In the First, he relates the Various Opinions of Ancient and Modern Writers, concerning the Origin of figured Stones; and gives an Account of the Deluge, as it is described by *Moses*, *Dr. Burnet*, and *Dr. Woodward*. He confutes the Description of the Two last Authors; and then produces the Reasons alledged by those who ascribe the Origin of figured Stones to the Deluge. In the Second Book he asserts at large the Opinion of those who maintain the Second System above mention'd, and answers all the Arguments alledged against it.

*Caroli Nicolai Langii, Lucernensis Helvet. Phil. & Med. Acad. Cae. Leopold. Societ. Reg. Prussiae, & Physico-Crit. Senens. Tractatus de Origine Lapidum figuratorum. Lucerna, 1709.*

### L U C C A.

**A** New Edition of the Latin Works of *Aloysius Juglaris*, a Jesuit, has been printed here.

*Aloysii Juglaris Niciensis, & Societate Jesu, Elogia. 12mo. pagg. 448.*

This Collection contains, 1. A Hundred Panegyrics upon *JESUS CHRIST*; printed the first time at *Genoa* in 1641. 2. Forty Panegyrics written in Honour of *Louis XIII.* printed at *Lyons* in 1644. 3. Many Inscriptions, Epitaphs, and Encomiums upon several Subjects; printed likewise at *Lyons* in the same Year. 4. Panegyrics upon the Greatest Bishops that have been in the Church; printed also at *Lyons* in the same Year, and reprinted at *Genoa* in 1653, with this Title, *Pars Secunda Elogiorum humanae complectens*.

*Aloysius Juglaris* was born at *Nice*, and admitted into the Society, in 1622. He taught Rhetorick for the space of Ten Years. Being afterwards call'd to the Court of *Savoy*, to be entrusted with the Education of *Prince Charles Emanuel*, he began to publish his First Works at *Turin*. He died at *Messina*, November 15. 1653.

**L O N D O N :** Printed by *J. Roberts*: And Sold by *A. Baldwin*, near the *Oxford-Arms* in *Warwick-Lane*. (Price 2 d.)